

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Applicant:** David W. Farchmin  
**Serial No.:** 10/800,285  
**Filed:** March 12, 2004  
**Title:** Juxtaposition Based Machine Addressing  
**Art Unit:** 2154  
**Confirm:** 1291  
**Examiner:** Goodchild, William J.  
**Our Ref.:** 110003.00026.03AB047

**Commissioner for Patents**  
**PO Box 1450,**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

**Box: Amendment**

**Dear Sir:**

Please enter the following remarks in response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2010 in the above referenced patent application.

---

**Remarks**

---

The Office Action rejected each of claims 54, 56-59 and 61-73 as obvious over Tanikoshi in view of Eidson. Applicant strongly traverses this rejection.

Claim 54 requires, among other things, the steps of, (1) providing a rule set including rules that indicate probable relative resource positions, (2) specifying that a first resource communicates with a second resource, (3) determining if relative juxtapositions of first and second resources are consistent with the rule set and (4) performing a secondary function when the relative juxtapositions of the first and second resources are inconsistent with the rule set. Requirements (1) and (3) above, when taken together, require that the rule set specify a probable relative juxtaposition of the first and second resources (i.e., if the rules did not specify probable relative positions of